DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 387 823 CS 215 092

AUTHOR Dorwick, Keith
TITLE The Last Bastion: Student Self-Determination and the Making of a Syllabus.
PUB DATE 25 Mar 95
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (46th, Washington, DC, March 23-25, 1995).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Controversial Issues (Course Content); *Course Content; *Curriculum Design; Higher Education; Homophobia; Research Papers (Students); *Student Centered Curriculum; *Student Interests; Student Needs; *Writing (Composition); Writing Exercises; Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Homosexual Literature; *University of Illinois Chicago

ABSTRACT

Aiming to develop both a philosophy and a rationale for student-determined course content, this paper proposes ways in which college students can determine reading content and writing assignments for their courses. An instructor and his students at the University of Illinois at Chicago developed course syllabi for English 152 (introduction to composition) and English 162 (composition II, a research paper course). Although there was much discussion pro and con among the students, the instructor did not relinquish all authority, since he continued to determine the number and length of assignments, due dates, evaluation standards, and penalties for late papers, and other things. The paper notes that the two classes functioned differently, but that by making choices for themselves, the students decided what was important in the process of their literacy on any given subject. The paper concludes with the complete syllabi developed for English 152 and English 151. (TB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 387 823

The Last Bastion: Student Self-Determination and the Making of a Syllabus

Keith Dorwick
The University of Illinois at Chicago
Department of English, m/c 162
601 S. Morgan
Chicago, IL 6067-7120

kdorwick@uic.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K. Dorwick
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Note: This paper was given as a presentation at the 1995 Conference on College Composition and Communication in Washington D.C. on March 25, 1995. As such, it was necessary to eliminate most of the theoretical and scholarly background for the issues I raise here, only because of time limitations. I decided to include the analysis of my syllabi even though time was short because I think talking about pedagogy is as important as talking about theory.

Keith Dorwick

In the last decade or so, most teachers have opened their classrooms to student self-determination in very many ways. Most educators at least tolerate -- if not enjoy -- a great deal of student freedom and room for choice in the classroom through work in small groups, student-led discussions both in the traditional classroom and in the computer lab, self-selection of topics for papers, student-taught classes, etc.

But there is what can be called the last bastion: usually we still determine the contents of our syllabi. Though many of us do feel comfortable, I would propose, with allowing our students to make small-scale decisions (as in "What day would you like to do your presentation?" and "Who wants to go first?", and perhaps even "What do you want to do your paper on, Eve?"), I would suspect more than a few teachers might find themselves in agreement with my colleague who critiqued a student-determined syllabus I had prepared for a course in gay and lesbian culture (which I'll talk about later) by asking who I thought was the teacher for the course.

She believed I was abdicating my role as teacher simply by allowing students to choose the readings for the course though I had chosen the subject matter and even the text. But I would disagree with my colleague, as much as I respect her teaching and professionalism. My experience is that student-self determination opens up a class in a way I had not experienced before in my teaching, that students do more self-assigned reading than they did my teacher-centered reading, and that they read more carefully. Further, they seem to be more involved in both class discussion and in their own writing.

Today I'm going to discuss several of the syllabi I've used in the past in an attempt to begin developing both a philosophy and a rationale for student-determined course-content. Let me begin by talking about the syllabi for two courses I taught at the University of

CS215092

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Illinois at Chicago: English 152, Introduction to English Composition, our so-called basic writing course, and English 161, English Composition II, our research paper course. I'll also have to give you a sense of the institutional context in which the two courses exist, in order to talk sensibly about what happened in my classes. Though I enjoyed teaching 152 back in Fall Semester, 1994, I've only recently begun to realize just how teacher-centered the syllabus at the front of the packet I've handed out was, for I had believed until recently that it offered my students freedom in the way I am proposing in this talk. For 152, I required students to write no less than three four to five typed double-spaced pages on a topic of their own choice and then to pick two of those papers for rewriting and for expansion to a total of eight to ten pages, all in 15 weeks!

While you're looking over the materials, I'll give you the background I promised earlier: 152 precedes the two composition courses required for all University of Illinois at Chicago students. Freshman at UIC end up in 152 as the result of a placement test in which they have to read a short selection of prose and write a brief essay that responds to a prompt given the students as they sit down to the test. There is no opportunity to take the placement essay home and revise it over a period of time; students who were preoccupied with personal affairs or ill the day of the test may end up in 152 as a result of poor performance on the test. Of course, many of our ESL students do not do at all well in the face of this kind of placement process and are put into a section of 152. In response to this situation, I tried to build a course that would allow students a great deal of freedom and this syllabus was the result. It wasn't until I completed the course that I realized just how closed and how instructor determined my open course in fact was.

Look at all the authority I did not relinquish -- I determined the number of assignments, the length of the assignments, the date they were due, the number of rewrites, the dates the rewrites were due, the number of papers that could be rewritten, the length of the rewritten papers, the percentage each paper was worth towards the final grade, the standards by which I evaluated the papers, the weight content held in that evaluation, the weight correctness held, the weight originality held, the penalties for a late paper being turned in late, the penalties for tardiness, the penalties for absence, even penalties for not speaking in class. Further, I told students that we would use group work to discuss the papers and the essays from our text, which I produced using Primis, which allows inclusion of material provided by the instructor. In this case, I used student essays written for an earlier section of our English 201, Introduction to Non-Fiction Prose.

Some of those requirements are very interesting given the student population taking the course: all but one of the students in that section were ESL. Think of what that means: only one of the students was from my own culture and could therefore understand the cultural position from which I created the course. I privileged creativity over invention in the classical sense of that term. As Rita Copeland puts it in her *Rhetoric, Hermenutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages*, invention "has little to do with originality or with creation ex nihilio. In all of its theoretical avatars, invention is what Roland Barthes has aptly termed an 'extractive' operation" (151). But one of my students was Arabian and, as Ilona Leki has pointed out in *Understanding ESL Writers*, students from his culture are at a disadvantage in assignments that don't have an fixed topic because it is the development of an idea, the ability to play with it and expand on it that is judged as literate in his

culture, not the ability to "do your own thinking" and "be creative" so privileged in ours. To sum up, the syllabus that I had thought of as so open was in fact very closed in terms of student tasks and expectations and not sensitive to the needs of writers from other cultures.

Now let us look at the second of the two syllabi I've provided in the handout: again, while you're looking over the syllabi for 161, I'll attempt to put that course in institutional perspective. *English Composition II* is a course mainly taught by TA's and by instructors; we are encouraged to create special topics. Thus, these courses are content-driven. Of course, as at many institutions, the students are more concerned with meeting the requirements and progressing towards their degrees than with the subject area of any given course, so they register for sections that fit their schedule without noticing the focus for the course. Sometimes they are unaware that 161 generally has a topic. This means that as many as 90% of our students are surprised when the instructor announces the topic. With a controversial topic like my "Writing about Lesbian and Gay Culture," the surprise can be quite intense.

Again, since 161, like 152, is a required course, I wanted to give students as much say in the course as I could. In this case, I gave them a text, *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, edited by Abelove, Barale, and Halperin, and the following framework: the students were required to design a five week unit for the course; their first writing assignment was a short proposal for the unit which consisted of a descriptive title, a summary of the goals and purposes for the unit, a list of the articles proposed for their reading list which had to come from at least two units of the reader, and one short writing assignment for each of the articles included in the unit. Students were then asked/required to bring five unsigned copies of their proposal to class and to go through a review process in five small groups. Each of the small groups would send two proposals for units to the rest of the class. These proposals could be the work of individual students as presented to the group and sent on without change, or could be proposals modified by the group from students' work, as the group desired. Each of the two units would culminate with a 4-6 page research paper on a specialized topic of the student's choice within the broader area of the unit's content area. That is, if a student was writing a paper for the unit on "Homophobia," she might choose to write about internalized homophobia, or analyze the assumptions behind the fear of openly gay and lesbian teachers in the classroom. Each student would then choose one of the two papers she'd developed during the class and expand it to a total of 8-10 pages with additional bibliographic resources.

Since there were five groups, there were a total of ten proposals; I gave photocopies of the ten proposals to the class and sent them home for the weekend. The next week, they worked together to winnow the ten selections to the two that we actually used. I relinquished my right to vote for any of the proposals on the grounds that doing so would be used as a clue by students to "give me what I wanted." In the process, my students chose one unit by a lesbian woman titled "Money, Power, and the Development of the Gay Community" and merged two of the units on "Homophobia," one by a straight-identified man, and one by a straight-identified woman, into one.

There were surprises for me: the best unit by far was by a gay man and was called "Sex." It was voted down, partially because it required a good deal of reading, partially because

eight units needed to be eliminated; something had to give. I would have loved to teach that unit; I think the course was weaker for not using it. But I had given up my right to choose, and so it went by the wayside. Procedurally, there were surprises, too. When the students could not choose between the two units on "Homophobia" submitted by the small groups, they asked me to choose. When I refused, they made the decision to take the time and effort to merge the two into one unit. Interestingly, their decision serves as a prime example of collaborative effort, for the decision to merge the two units into one was done for the sake of the small groups. As one of the students reasoned, the small groups had done their job well and had picked out a good topic. This was evident from the fact that two of the groups had chosen the exact same theme; clearly, he argued, both of those groups had done a good job of reading the community of the classroom. And therefore, again, as this student argued, the good work of both groups should be honored by choosing elements from both units. This concern, an attempt to be sensitive to the effects of the class's collective power over various constituencies within the group, was central in helping these disparate students begin to come together as a community.

Now, to my mind, these two classes functioned very differently. The research paper course gave students less control over their selection of topics than the selection of topics available to writers in the first course I described -- but I picked the texts. In the case of the research paper course, I traded some student control over their own writing by narrowing the topic of the course to gay and lesbian issues for student control over an aspect of the classroom over which not one of my students had ever had any choice: what texts were to be taught. In doing so, I believe that I allowed my students to develop and change their own literacy. In 1982, Janet Emig addressed this conference in the keynote speech titled "Literacy and Freedom" (reprinted in her *The Web of Meaning*) with the following words: "Our view of literacy is grounded, as well as informed. We know that words are events affecting other events; and that if students are truly to learn to read and write, they must witness literacy making a difference, first to themselves, then to others" (175).

Student literacy, the ability to read, write, and think critically, and to make an argument in terms and though logical modes that are accepted by the academy must occur, though students must find ways of doing so that preserve their own ways of knowing. Whether we like it or not, they are in a power struggle with us and with the institutions to which we are beholden. One of the loci for that struggle is the choice of texts. We choose texts and make assignments and students resist us as teachers in a great and varied number of ways -- they forget the textbook at home, they thought they had to read essay x next week, they didn't know the paper was due this week, they sit silent in our discussions, they cut class, they attempt to distract us with irrelevant questions. On a computer network, there are even more opportunities to resist: they can flame each other, they can quote Grateful Dead lyrics, they can anonymously attack both the teacher and the other class members, they can play Flight Simulator and Tetris, they can bring down the system and interrupt class by deleting software from the hard drive, they can infect the system with viruses.

And why shouldn't they resist? We are telling them what to read, and how to write, often without giving them any reason why they should do so. So long as they recognize that we

have the power, they can and will subvert that power in any way possible until we can find a way to negotiate new power structures.

So we -- and here by "we" I intend to mean both students and teachers -- must look for other ways to inscribe the power relationships that operate in the classroom. Where could we look for other roles? I would suggest feminism and collaborative ways of learning, which have so often been the work of women in the academy, and here I am indebted to Karen Gosselink, Tina Kazan, Cathy Colton, and most of all, Carrie Brekke, all of whom are my valued colleagues in our Writing Center, for modeling other ways of putting together a class, including the development of a syllabi by the class and the creation of individual syllabi for each student. As Angelika Bammer has written in her article, "Mastery," published in Hartman and Messer-Davidow's *(En)Gendering Knowledge*, "[w]e inevitably see from our own centers, from the categories that constitute the identities that we have learned to call our selves. Rejecting the perspectives of those men (and women) whose privileged positions blind them to the realties of gender, race, and class, feminists have insisted on the need not only to be conscious of these realities but also to understand the ways in which our affiliations, chosen or imposed, constitute significant differences among us" (245).

What am I proposing is that this feminist vision can, if taken to heart, make us wonder not only how to choose materials for and on behalf of our students, but even if we should do so. It is this increasing awareness of mine that my students know what they want out of a class and out of their education that drives this talk and my conviction that the work of creating a syllabus can be a corporate act undertaken by the community as a whole. And it is that act that allows me to differentiate between the two courses. The simple act -- if indeed it was simple -- of letting students create the specific reading list for the queer studies course means that they shaped their learning experience in ways I could not anticipate. And allowing students to choose readings goes beyond the act of letting students choose their own topics for writing because of the way we privilege other peoples' texts over the texts created by our students in the composition course. Elsewhere in "Literacy and Freedom," Emig argued "[t]he college classroom in English then is a hierarchy with four levels of written matter . . . [Lowest in this hierarchy] are student compositions, what students write . . . (173-174)." One way we can overturn that hierarchy is to let our students know that their writing does indeed matter, especially through self-publishing, but that is a topic for another paper. Allowing students to choose texts for their own purposes also upsets that hierarchy. If a student includes a particular essay in her proposal, is that reading important? Clearly it is: it has become a class reading. And how is it important? Let me repeat Emig's call to literacy once again because it is so important to hear what she said in San Francisco, in 1982: "[o]ur view of literacy is grounded, as well as informed. We know that words are events affecting other events, and that if students are truly to learn to read and write, they must witness literacy making a difference, first to themselves and then to others." It is for these reasons that the student-included essay and the student-centered syllabi are important: by making choices for themselves, the students decide what is important in the process of their literacy on any given subject.

Works Cited:

Bammer, Angelika. "Mastery." *(En)Gendering Knowledge: Feminists in Academe*. Edited by Joan E. Hartman and Ellen Messer-Davidow. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P., 1991.

Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermenutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Emig, Janet. *The Web of Meaning: Essays on Writing, Teaching, Learning, and Thinking*. Edited by Dixie Goswami and Maureen Butler. Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc., 1983.

Leki, Ilona. *Understanding ESL Writers: A Guide for Teachers*. Monclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc., 1992.

Appendix: Syllabi for English 152 and English 151

Syllabus: Introduction to English Composition (English 152)
Keith Dorwick, Instructor

Required Texts:

Dorwick, Keith, ed., *Introduction to English Composition*. New York: McGraw-Hill Primis, 1993.

Reagan, Sally Barr, et al., *Writing from A to Z: The Easy to Use Reference Handbook*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1994.

Note: Academic dishonesty (including plagiarism) will earn you a failing grade for the course. The 1991-93 UIC Undergraduate Catalog defines academic dishonesty under the section, "Guidelines Regarding Academic Integrity," and is available for purchase in the UIC bookstore.

Goals: By the end of this course, you will have improved on your reading, writing and classroom skills: successful students will be able to create, revise and rewrite carefully well-crafted prose, and to be able to work in groups. The emphasis of the course will be preparation for your future work at UIC with a special emphasis on English 160, English Composition I.

Attendance: Poor attendance and tardiness will affect your final grade for the course, at my discretion.

Assignments: You will keep a writing journal for this class, which will be on an IBM 3.5 computer disk and which will be handed in at regular intervals for my comments

(computers are available for student use on campus). You will also turn in five longer formal essays: three 4-6 page essays and two 8-10 page essays that will grow out of and be a development and refinement of two of your shorter essays. Your writing must reflect your ability to control and use audience, grammar, usage, diction, tone and style, and may use any of the various rhetorical modes (description, narration, definition, classification, argument and persuasion) we will study during the class, though the use of any particular mode is NOT a requirement for your writing. I may also assign other informal assignments as necessary.

Format: You must type all (repeat, all) written assignments for this class, including any informal exercises I might assign. Please use one inch margins all around (top, bottom, left, right). Do not use large fonts that take up a lot of room on the page. I know this trick.

Do not use wide margins that really cut down the numbers of words per line, I know that trick also.

Evaluation: You will receive five formal grades (the average of which will be your basic writing score) and one holistic score for this class. Each of the five essays is 20% of your writing score. I will then modify your writing score by assigning a holistic score which looks at your performance on informal writing assignments, class participation, rewriting and revision, computer and class participation and group work using the following criteria:

Students who wish to receive a holistic score of HP (High Pass) will:

- rewrite written assignments as necessary using the suggestions both of their peers and of the instructor. Rewrites will be substantial, involving both rethinking and reorganizing ideas, and correction of all error.
- perform honestly and well in student peer groups and act as resource for other students. They will offer in-depth criticism of the writing produced by their peers and not allow any personal differences between members of their groups to affect the work of the group. They will meet outside class on their own time if the group decides that additional group time is necessary. They will always provide adequate copies of the work being evaluated and be open to criticism and suggestions for change.
- take part in all discussions and show evidence of having completed all assigned readings for the course.

Students who wish to receive a holistic score of P (Pass) will:

- rewrite written assignments as necessary using the suggestions both of their peers and of the instructor; their changes will, however, tend to the local (substitution of one word for another, for instance). Their rewrites will not, for the most part, show evidence of reorganization or the creation of new text. There will be very little evidence of a distinction between rewriting and editing, but they will eliminate all grammatical error.

- take part in all group work, but will not significantly help the other writers in their group. Their criticism will focus mostly on the local level (i.e., "you spelled 'university' with a 'z'"). They will meet outside class times, but only as a last resort. Other group members will need to police them, needing to remind them of meeting times and places. They will often attempt to justify the reasons they "did something" rather than listen to group and consider changes. They will usually provide sufficient copies of work that the group is evaluating.
- take part in all discussions and show evidence of having completed all assigned readings for the course.

Students who wish to receive a holistic score of F (Fail) will:

- turn in rewrites that show very little evidence of any actual rewriting. There will no or few changes in structure, no or few ideas generated for the rewrite, and little or no creation of any new text. The writer in this category will use no or few suggestions from either the instructor or class peers.
- contribute little or nothing to peer groups. Students will limit their comments to the affective ("I liked it" or "I didn't like it") but not provide either reasons why or suggestions for further change. The writer in this category will not meet outside class and will miss class sessions when the groups will work during class time. This writer will not turn in materials on time, and will usually not provide adequate numbers of copies of assignments for the group.
- contribute little or nothing to class discussions, and will show little or no evidence of having read the assigned material for the day.

A grade of HP on the holistic score will raise your writing score one whole grade level. A grade of P will not affect your writing score at all. A grade of F on the holistic score will lower your writing score one whole grade level. The modified writing score will be your final grade for the course. Thus if a student with a writing score of B received a HP, the final grade would be an A. If she received a holistic score of P, her final grade would remain a B. A holistic score of F would lower her final grade to a C.

There will be a public reading at which all members of the class will present excerpts from one of their 8-10 page papers! No one is exempted! This reading will be scheduled during the fifteenth week of the semester. Missing the final reading will mean an F for the holistic score! On the other hand, I will supply a cheese tray and wine.....

About the Portfolio Assessment: It is possible to use this course as a substitute for English 160 and progress directly to English 161 (English Composition II) by taking part in the English 160 portfolio assessment. This option will only be available to those students who have a basic writing score of A at the twelfth week of the semester!

Schedule:

This schedule is tentative and subject to change throughout the semester. Always bring your individual work -- I will give you class time to do your writing.

Note: an asterisk and a date in bold indicates that a first draft of a new paper is due that day.

Week One:

8/22/94: Introduction To Course, Diagnostic
8/24/94: Group Work -- Diagnostic Discussion/Paper Topics

Week Two:

8/29/94: Library -- Introduction To Library Resources
8/31/94: *Group Work -- First Paper (Paper 1 Drafts Due)

Week Three:

9/5/94: Labor Day -- No Class
9/7/94: Dorwick, 7-10, 51-59

Week Four:

9/12/94: Dorwick, 11-16, 60-68, 86-93, Paper 1 Due (4-6 Pages)
9/14/94: *Author's Chair (Paper 2 Drafts Due)

Week Five:

9/19/94: In Class Student Conferences (Bring Paper 2 Draft)
9/21/94: In Class Student Conferences (Bring Paper 2 Draft)

Week Six:

9/26/94: Group Work (Paper 2 Drafts)
9/28/94: Dorwick, 17-22, 94-105, Paper 2 Due (4-6 Pages)

Week Seven:

10/3/94: *Author's Chair (Paper 3 Drafts Due)
10/5/94: Dorwick, 23-24, 106-117

Week Eight:

10/10/94: Dorwick, 27-31, 69-82
10/12/94: Group Work (Paper 3 Drafts)

Week Nine:

10/17/94: Author's Chair (Paper 3 Drafts)
10/19/94: Dorwick, 32-39, 118-129, Paper 3 Due (4-6 Pages)

Week Ten:

10/24/94: *Author's Chair (Paper 4 Drafts Due)
10/26/94: Dorwick, 40-45, 83-85, 130-138

Week Eleven:

10/31/94: In Class Student Conferences (Bring Paper 4 Draft)
11/2/94: In Class Student Conferences (Bring Paper 4 Draft)

Week Twelve:

11/7/94: Group Work (Paper 4 Drafts)
11/9/94: Dorwick, 46-50, 139-164, Paper 4 Due (8-10 Pages)

Week Thirteen:

11/14/94: *Author's Chair (Paper 5 Drafts)
11/16/94: Group Work (Paper 5 Drafts)

Week Fourteen:

11/21/94: Author's Chair (Rewrites Of Papers 1-4)
11/23/94: Group Work (Rewrites Of Papers 1-4)

Week Fifteen:

11/28/94: Presentations -- Location TBD
11/30/94: Presentations -- Location TBD, Paper 5 Due: (8-10 Pages)

Syllabus: English Composition II (English 161): Writing about Lesbian and Gay Culture
Keith Dorwick

Required Texts: Abelove, Henry, Michèle Aina Barale and David M. Halperin, eds. *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Hacker, Diana. *A Writer's Reference. 2nd edition*. New York: Bedford, 1992.

Note: Academic dishonesty (including plagiarism) will earn you a failing grade for the course. The 1991-93 UIC Undergraduate Catalog defines academic dishonesty under the section, "Guidelines Regarding Academic Integrity," and is available for purchase in the UIC bookstore.

Goals: By the end of this course, you will have learned the basics of academic research using both physical and electronic media, spoken both formally and informally before a group and improved your basic writing skills. You will have also read some of the basic texts necessary for further work in the field of gay and lesbian studies. The major emphasis of this course is on well written academic prose.

Attendance: Poor attendance and tardiness will affect your final grade for the course, at my discretion.

Assignments: You will write a number of short, fairly informal assignments and three longer formal essays: two 4-6 page papers and one 8-10 page paper that will focus on the conjunctions, intersections and differences between the lesbian/gay communities and the larger culture of which we are all (gay, straight or bisexual) members. The 8-10 page paper will build on one or more of the shorter assignments; all three papers will require outside ("library") research including sources that demonstrate a use of the electronic catalogs available to all UIC students. You must type all (repeat, all) written assignments

for this class, including any informal exercises I might assign. Please use one inch margins all around (top, bottom, left, right).

Evaluation: You will receive one grade for this class and it is the grade that will appear on your transcript. I will grade you holistically (that is, by looking at your performance in the class as a whole) using the following criteria:

[The criteria which appeared here are the same as the criteria which I used in the syllabus for English 152 reproduced above.]

Schedule: This schedule is tentative and subject to change throughout the semester.

Introduction and research tools

Week One:

8/24/93: Introduction to course, diagnostic
8/26/93: The computer lab (please meet at Addams 110): Library Information Tools

Week Two:

8/31/93: The computer lab (please meet at Addams 110): Library Tools
9/2/93: The computer lab (please meet at Addams 110): E-mail (optional)

Week Three:

9/7/93: Unit Proposal Workshop 1 (Groups)
9/9/93: Unit Proposal Workshop 2 (Class)

Unit 1: Money, Power And The Development Of The Gay Community

---

Week Four:

9/14/93: "Commodity Lesbianism," Clark (186-201)

- Is the commodization of the lesbian 'image' a tactic which further includes or lesbians into mainstream heterosexual culture?

9/16/93: "Capitalism And Gay Identity," D'Emilio (467-478)

- "Only when individuals began to make their living through wage labor . . . was it possible for homosexual desire to coalesce into a personal identity." Do you agree? Why or why not?

Week Five:

9/21/93: "Deviance, Politics And The Media," Hall (62-90)
9/23/93: "Deviance," Continued

Week Six:

9/28/93: "Television/Feminism: Heartbeat And Prime-Time Lesbianism," Torres (176-185)

- Are feminism and lesbianism used interchangeably by the media? Give examples.

9/30/93: "The Spectacle Of Aids," Watney (202-211)

- Who gets to control what images get shown of the lesbian, gay and bisexual communities? How is it done, and why?

Week Seven:

10/5/93: Writing Workshop Paper 1
10/7/93: Writing Workshop Paper 1

Week Eight:

10/12/93: No Class - Student Conferences
10/14/93: No Class - Student Conferences

Unit 2: Homophobia

Week Nine:

10/19/93: "Thinking Sex," Rubin (3-44), Paper 1 Due, No Late Papers Accepted!

- "In the late 1940's until the early 1960's homosexuals were, along with communists, the object of federal witch hunts and purges." Why did these people allow this to happen to their fellow Americans?

10/21/93: "Homophobia: Why Bring It Up?" Smith (99-102)

- "Homophobia is usually the last oppression to be mentioned, the last to be taken, the last to go. But it is extremely serious, sometimes to the point of being fatal." Do you agree with this? Why or why not?

Week Ten:

10/26/93: "Epistemology Of The Closet," Sedgwick (45-61)

- "The lie, the perfect lie, about people we know, about the relations we have had with them, about our motive for some action, formulated in totally different terms, the lie as to what we are, whom we love, what we feel with regard to people who love us . . . " Please react to this statement.

10/28/93: "Compulsory Heterosexuality And Lesbian Existence," Rich (227-254)

- "I am concerned here with two other matters as well: first, how and why women's choices of women as passionate comrades, life partners, co-workers, lovers, community, has been crushed, invalidated, forced into hiding and disguise; second, the

virtual or total neglect of lesbian existence in a wide range of writings, including feminist scholarship" (your reactions?)

Week Eleven:

11/2/93: Sedgwick And Rich, Continued...
11/4/93: "Just When You Thought It Was Safe To Go Back In The Water," Selden (221-226)

- How did people's prejudice of the homosexual community evolve into blaming them for the AIDS epidemic?

Week Twelve:

11/9/93: No Class -- Instructor Conflict
11/11/93: Instructor's Choice

Week Thirteen:

11/16/93: Writing Workshop Paper 2
11/18/93: Writing Workshop Paper 2

Conclusions: Paper Presentations

Week Fourteen:

11/23/93: Paper Presentations, Paper 2 Due: No Late Papers Accepted!
11/25/93: No Class -- Thanksgiving Holiday

Week Fifteen:

11/30/93: Paper Presentations
12/2/93: Paper Presentations

Finals Week: TBD, Final 8-10 Page Paper Due! No Late Papers Accepted!